arXiv:0803.1419v1 [astro-ph] 10 Mar 2008

TeV-photon paradox and space with SU(2) fuzziness

Ahmad Shariati[1]
Mohammad Khorrami[2]
Amir H. Fatollahi[3]

Department of Physics, Alzahra University, Tehran 1993891167, Iran

Abstract

The possibility is examined that a model based on space noncommutativity of linear type can explain why photons from distant sources with multi-TeV energies can reach earth. In particular within a model in which space coordinates satisfy the algebra of SU(2) Lie group, it is shown that there is the possibility that the pair production through the reaction of CMB and energetic photons would be forbidden kinematically.

[1]shariati@mailaps.org
[2]mamwad@mailaps.org
[3]ahfatol@gmail.com

1 Introduction

There have been arguments supporting the idea that the ordinary picture of spacetime breaks down when is measured in intervals comparable with the Planck length and time. In particular, in an ultra-large momentum transfer experiment a black-hole may be formed, and as long as it lives before its rapid evaporation, an outer observer experiences limits on information transfer from the volume element comparable in size with the horizon [1]. These kinds of reasoning may lead one to believe in some kinds of space-space and space-time uncertainty relations [1]. As uncertainty relations usually point to noncommutative objects, it is reasonable to consider various versions of noncommutative spacetime theories. Some important examples of these kinds of spacetimes are 1) the canonical one:

$$[\widehat{x}^{\,\mu}, \widehat{x}^{\,\nu}] = \mathrm{i}\,\theta^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{1}, \tag{1}$$

with $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ an antisymmetric constant tensor,
2) the κ-Poincaé spacetime

$$[\widehat{x}_a, \widehat{t}\,] = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\kappa}\,\widehat{x}_a, \quad [\widehat{x}_a, \widehat{x}_b] = 0, \tag{2}$$

where κ is a constant, and
3) the Lie algebra type

$$[\widehat{x}_a, \widehat{x}_b] = f^c{}_{a\,b}\,\widehat{x}_c, \quad [\widehat{x}_a, \widehat{t}\,] = 0, \tag{3}$$

where $f^c{}_{a\,b}$'s are structure constants of a Lie algebra [2–6]. In the two latter cases, a, b and c refer to spatial directions. Recent developments in understanding the dynamics of D-branes of string theory, have renewed interest for studying field theories on noncommutative spacetimes. In particular, the longitudinal directions of D-branes in the presence of constant B-field background appear to be noncommutative, as seen by the ends of open strings [5, 6].

There have been a large number of works devoted to study various phenomenological implications of noncommutative picture of spacetime [7]. In particular, the two latter examples mentioned above cause the energy-momentum dispersion relations as well as the momentum conservation laws differ from those in the ordinary spacetime [2, 8]. These different aspects would open a possibility by which one might try to explain some paradoxical behaviors that have already been reported in the spectrum of ultrarelativistic particles reaching the earth from distant sources, one of them is the so-called "TeV-photon paradox". As photons from very distant sources should pass through the photon-bath of the 2.7 K Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation, it is expected that photons with energies of several TeV or higher have very little chance to reach earth, as they should react with the low energy photons of CMB to create electron-positron pairs through the reaction $\gamma\,\gamma \to e^-e^+$. A large number of such multi-TeV, however, have been reported to reach the earth (see e.g. [9]),

implying that the universe is perhaps more transparent to TeV-photons than it should be, the so-called TeV-photon paradox.

Among other things, there have been attempts aiming to understand a new physics from the unexpected behavior of energetic particles. Models based on violation of Lorentz invariance [10], expectations from quantum gravity effects [11], large extra dimensions [12], and noncommutativity of κ-Poincaré type [13, 14] are examples. A common thing in a majority of the above-mentioned approaches is that perhaps a deformed energy-momentum dispersion relation, or a deformation of conservation laws, could explain why such kinds of photons or other ultrahigh-energy particles can reach the earth. In particular, it could be that these deformations *kinematicaly* forbid such pair creations, or at least push them to higher energies. The aim of the present paper is to investigate the effect of a particular noncommutativity of space, namely a noncommutativity of Lie-algebra type with the Lie algebra SU(2) [8], on such pair creations. It is shown that the introduction of such noncommutativity does indeed push the threshold of pair production to higher energies and could even forbid it at all.

The scheme of the rest of this paper is the following. In section 2, a brief review is given on kinematical relations as well as conservation laws in a theory on noncommutative spaces of SU(2) algebra type. In section 3 the analysis is presented to find the threshold condition in which the pair production would occur, based on one can set the parameters to prevent the reaction. Section 4 is devoted to the concluding remarks.

2 Conservation laws and dispersion relations

In [8] a model was introduced based on noncommutativity of Lie algebra type in which, as will be seen in more detail, the momentum conservation law as well as the energy-momentum dispersion relation are different from those in the ordinary space. In particular, a model is investigated in a 3+1 dimensional space-time the dimensionless spatial position operators of which are generators of a regular representation of the SU(2) algebra, that is

$$[\widehat{x}_a, \widehat{x}_b] = \epsilon^c{}_{a\,b}\, \widehat{x}_c. \tag{4}$$

As it was discussed in [8], one can use the group algebra as the analogue of functions defined on ordinary space, with group elements $U = \exp(\ell\, k^a\, \widehat{x}_a)$ as the analogues of $\exp(\mathrm{i}\, \mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})$, which are a basis for the functions defined on the space. In both cases $\mathbf{k}$ is an ordinary vector with $\mathbf{k} = (k^1, k^2, k^3)$. That is the components of $\mathbf{k}$ are commuting numbers. In the case of noncommutative space, ℓ is a length parameter, and the vector $\mathbf{k}$ is restricted to a ball of radius $(2\,\pi/\ell)$, with all points of the boundary identified to a single point. The manifold of $\mathbf{k}$ is in fact a 3-sphere. $\mathbf{k}$ can be thought of as the momentum of a particle. While in the ordinary space one has simple conservation of momentum in the sense that for a collection of incoming particles there is a relation

$$\sum_i \mathbf{k}_i = 0, \tag{5}$$

in the case of noncommutative space one has (as was shown in [8])

$$U_1\,U_2\,\cdots=\mathbf{1}, \tag{6}$$

or similar equations in which the order of U_i's has been changed. In particular, if two particles with momenta $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ collide with each other, the *momentum* of the system is $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)$ or $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1)$ with

$$\exp[\ell\,\gamma^a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}')\,\widehat{x}_a]:=\exp(\ell\,k^a\,\widehat{x}_a)\,\exp(\ell\,k'^a\,\widehat{x}_a). \tag{7}$$

The explicit form of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}\cos\left(\frac{\ell\,\gamma}{2}\right)&=\cos\left(\frac{\ell\,k}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{\ell\,k'}{2}\right)-\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{k}}'\,\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k'}{2}\right),\\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\,\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,\gamma}{2}\right)&=\hat{\mathbf{k}}\times\hat{\mathbf{k}}'\,\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k'}{2}\right)\\ &\quad+\hat{\mathbf{k}}\,\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{\ell\,k'}{2}\right)+\hat{\mathbf{k}}'\,\sin\left(\frac{\ell\,k'}{2}\right)\cos\left(\frac{\ell\,k}{2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

It is easy to see that in the limit $\ell\to 0$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ tends to $\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'$, as expected. It is emphasized, as the time direction is not involved in the noncommutativity relation (3), the energy conservation law is just like in ordinary space. As a final remark, the energy-momentum dispersion relation would come of the form [8]

$$E=\sqrt{m^2+\left(\frac{4}{\ell}\right)^2\,\sin^2\left(\frac{k\,\ell}{4}\right)}, \tag{9}$$

with m as the mass of the particle. Again it is seen that in the limit $\ell\to 0$ one has $E=\sqrt{m^2+k^2}$, just like the case of the ordinary space.

3 Pair production from two colliding photons

Consider the pair-production reaction $\gamma\,\gamma\to e^-e^+$. Of the two incoming photons, one is a CMB photon (particle 0), and the other an energetic one (particle 1). The two outgoing particles (particles 2 and 3) are of mass m. The conservation laws are

$$E_2+E_3=E_0+E_1, \tag{10}$$

$$U_2\,U_3=U_0\,U_1. \tag{11}$$

A note is in order concerning the second equality. This is in fact only one possibility among six possibilities. These possibilities arise from the fact that in (6), one can change the order of U_i's. Instead of changing the order of U_i's, however, one can use properly-similarity-transformes U_i's with the same order. So, reminding that in our case at least kinematically the roles by particles 2 and 3 can be exchanged, one could write

$$U'_2\,U'_3=U'_0\,U'_1 \tag{12}$$

instead of (11), where U_i''s are obtained from certain similarity transformations acting on U_i's. One notes that a similarity transformation on $U(\mathbf{k})$ does not change the length of $\mathbf{k}$, and hence leaves the dispersion relation (9) intact.

It is convenient to move to new variables defined by

$$\epsilon := \frac{E}{m}, \tag{13}$$

$$u := \sin\left(\frac{k\,\ell}{4}\right), \tag{14}$$

$$\mu := \frac{m\,\ell}{4}. \tag{15}$$

One then has for massive particles (2 and 3)

$$u = \mu\,\sqrt{\epsilon^2 - 1}. \tag{16}$$

where $\epsilon \geq 1$, and for massless particles (0 and 1)

$$u = \mu\,\epsilon. \tag{17}$$

So the energy conservation reads

$$\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 = \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1. \tag{18}$$

In (12), LH and RH, as the lengths of the momenta corresponding to the left-hand side and the right-hand side, respectively, are

$$\mathrm{LH} := \cos\left(\frac{k_2\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\cos\left(\frac{k_3\,\ell}{2}\right) - \hat{\mathbf{k}'}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}'}_3\,\sin\left(\frac{k_2\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\sin\left(\frac{k_3\,\ell}{2}\right), \tag{19}$$

$$\mathrm{RH} := \cos\left(\frac{k_0\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\cos\left(\frac{k_1\,\ell}{2}\right) - \hat{\mathbf{k}'}_0 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}'}_1\,\sin\left(\frac{k_0\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\sin\left(\frac{k_1\,\ell}{2}\right), \tag{20}$$

with

$$0 \leq \frac{k_i\,\ell}{2} \leq \pi. \tag{21}$$

One has

$$\mathrm{LH} = \mathrm{RH}. \tag{22}$$

The aim is to find a threshold for the energy of particle 1, in order that the reaction occurs. In the case of the ordinary space, at this the outgoing particles have equal velocities. Here things look more complicated. Using (19), (20), and the condition (21), one finds

$$\mathrm{LH} \geq \cos\left(\frac{k_2\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\cos\left(\frac{k_3\,\ell}{2}\right) - \sin\left(\frac{k_2\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\sin\left(\frac{k_3\,\ell}{2}\right), \tag{23}$$

$$\mathrm{RH} \leq \cos\left(\frac{k_0\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\cos\left(\frac{k_1\,\ell}{2}\right) + \sin\left(\frac{k_0\,\ell}{2}\right)\,\sin\left(\frac{k_1\,\ell}{2}\right). \tag{24}$$

At threshold the right-hand sides equal each other, resulting in

$$\sin\left[\frac{(k_2+k_3)\,\ell}{4}\right]=\sin\left[\frac{(k_1-k_0)\,\ell}{4}\right]. \tag{25}$$

One may ask about an altered choice in place of inequalities (23) and (24), in which the role of LH and RH are exchanged. That choice would give a more sever constraint on k_1. The reason is that if (25) is satisfied with k_0, k_1, and some k_2 and k_3, then to fulfil the conservation of momentum with the angle between $\mathbf{k}_0$ and $\mathbf{k}_1$ less than π, k_2 and k_3 should be increased, meaning that the energy of the outgoing particles should increase while that of the incoming particles is kept constant. This violates the energy conservation. The threshold condition (25) is in fact similar to its analogue in the case of the ordinary space, where the collision is head-on and the outgoing particles move in the same direction.

The condition (25) can be written like

$$u_2\sqrt{1-u_3^2}+u_3\sqrt{1-u_2^2}=u_1\sqrt{1-u_0^2}-u_0\sqrt{1-u_1^2}. \tag{26}$$

Defining

$$A:=\epsilon_1\sqrt{1-\mu^2\,\epsilon_0^2}-\epsilon_0\sqrt{1-\mu^2\,\epsilon_1^2}, \tag{27}$$

for which, by (26), one has

$$\sqrt{(\epsilon_2^2-1)\,[1-\mu^2\,(\epsilon_3^2-1)]}+\sqrt{(\epsilon_3^2-1)\,[1-\mu^2\,(\epsilon_2^2-1)]}=A, \tag{28}$$

and further defining

$$a:=\frac{\epsilon_0+\epsilon_1}{2}=\frac{\epsilon_2+\epsilon_3}{2}\geq 1, \tag{29}$$

$$x:=\epsilon_2-a=a-\epsilon_3, \tag{30}$$

$$z:=x^2, \tag{31}$$

it is seen that the condition (25) can be written like

$$f(z)=0, \tag{32}$$

where

$$f(z):=f_0+f_1\,z+f_2\,z^2, \tag{33}$$

with

$$f_0:=4\,A^2\,(a^2-1)\,[1-\mu^2\,(a^2-1)]-A^4, \tag{34}$$

$$f_1:=4\,(A^2-4\,a^2+2\,\mu^2\,A^2+2\,\mu^2\,A^2\,a^2), \tag{35}$$

$$f_2:=-4\,\mu^2\,A^2. \tag{36}$$

We remind by (16) $\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3\geq 1$, leading to the condition $-(a-1)\leq x\leq a-1$. So only those roots of (32) are acceptable that satisfy

$$0\leq z\leq (a-1)^2. \tag{37}$$

So the aim is to find values of μ and ϵ_1 so that (32) and (37) are satisfied.

Using the known values of the electron mass m and the energy of a typical CMB photon, one has

$$\epsilon_0 \sim 10^{-9}. \tag{38}$$

So, reminding (18), and $\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \geq 1$ by (16), we have

$$\epsilon_1 > 1. \tag{39}$$

$\tilde{E}_1$ (the threshold energy in the ordinary space) satisfies

$$\tilde{E}_1 \, E_0 = m^2, \tag{40}$$

or

$$\mu = \frac{\tilde{E}_1 \, \ell}{4} \, \epsilon_0. \tag{41}$$

From (9), however, it is seen that for massless particle 1

$$E_1 \leq \frac{4}{\ell}. \tag{42}$$

Assuming photons of the energy $\tilde{E}_1$ have in fact been observed, one has

$$\tilde{E}_1 \leq \frac{4}{\ell}, \tag{43}$$

resulting in

$$\mu \leq \epsilon_0. \tag{44}$$

Using these, one can approximate A and a to get

$$A \simeq \epsilon_1 - C \, \epsilon_0, \tag{45}$$

where

$$C := \sqrt{1 - u_1^2}, \tag{46}$$

and

$$\frac{f_0}{A^2} = 2 \, \epsilon_1 \, \epsilon_0 \, (1 + C) - 4 - \frac{\mu^2}{4} \, (\epsilon_1^4 + 4 \, \epsilon_1^3 \, \epsilon_0 - 8 \, \epsilon_1^2), \tag{47}$$

$$\frac{f_1}{A^2} = 4 \left[-2 \, \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_1} \, (1 + C) + 2 \, \mu^2 + \frac{\mu^2 \, \epsilon_1^2}{2} + \mu^2 \, \epsilon_1 \, \epsilon_0 \right], \tag{48}$$

$$\frac{f_2}{A^2} = -\, 4 \, \mu^2. \tag{49}$$

Also the discriminator of (32) becomes

$$\frac{\Delta'}{16 \, A^4} = \mu^4 \, \epsilon_1^2 - \mu^2 + 2 \, (1 + C) \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_1} \right)^2. \tag{50}$$

If $\epsilon_1 \sim 1$, then f_0, f_1, and f_2 are all negative, showing that for nonnegative z the value of $f(z)$ is negative. Hence

$$\epsilon_1 \gg 1. \tag{51}$$

Using these,

$$\frac{f_0}{A^2} = 2\,\epsilon_1\,\epsilon_0\,(1+C) - 4 - \frac{\mu^2\,\epsilon_1^4}{4}, \tag{52}$$

$$\frac{f_1}{A^2} = 4\,\left[-2\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_1}\,(1+C) + \frac{\mu^2\,\epsilon_1^2}{2}\right], \tag{53}$$

$$\frac{f_2}{A^2} = -\,4\,\mu^2, \tag{54}$$

$$\frac{\Delta'}{16\,A^4} = \mu^4\,\epsilon_1^2 - \mu^2 + 2\,(1+C)\,\left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_1}\right)^2. \tag{55}$$

The condition that Δ' be nonnegative is then

$$u_1^2\,(1-u_1^2) \le 2\,(1+C)\,\epsilon_0^2. \tag{56}$$

Reminding (38), this shows that u_1 is either close to zero or close to one. So, there are two cases:
Case I ($u_1 \simeq 0$):

$$C \simeq 1, \tag{57}$$

yielding

$$0 \le u_1 \lesssim 2\,\epsilon_0, \tag{58}$$

by (56). As f_2 is negative, in order that there exists a positive solution for (32), at least one of f_0 or f_1 should be positive. The condition that f_1 be positive, is

$$u_1^3 \gtrsim 8\,\mu\,\epsilon_0. \tag{59}$$

This together with (58) gives a necessary condition that f_1 be positive:

$$\frac{\mu}{\epsilon_0^2} \le 1. \tag{60}$$

The condition that f_0 be positive is that

$$4\,(\epsilon_0\,\epsilon_1) - 4 - \frac{1}{4}\,\left(\frac{\mu}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)^2\,(\epsilon_0\,\epsilon_1)^4 \ge 0, \tag{61}$$

which gives

$$\frac{\mu}{\epsilon_0^2} \le 4\,\sqrt{\frac{(\epsilon_0\,\epsilon_1)-1}{(\epsilon_0\,\epsilon_1)^4}}. \tag{62}$$

So, by the maximum of right-hand-side of (62), we have

$$\frac{\mu}{\epsilon_0^2} \le \frac{\sqrt{27}}{4}. \tag{63}$$

If both (60) and (63) are violated, then there is no positive solution for (32).
Case II ($u_1 \simeq 1$):

$$C \simeq 0, \tag{64}$$

yielding

$$1 - \epsilon_0^2 \lesssim u_1 \leq 1, \tag{65}$$

by (56). Defining

$$w := z - (a-1)^2, \tag{66}$$

$$\tilde{f}(w) := f(z), \tag{67}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(w) = \tilde{f}_0 + \tilde{f}_1\, w + \tilde{f}_2\, w^2, \tag{68}$$

one arrives at

$$\frac{\tilde{f}_0}{A^2} = -\,8, \tag{69}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{f}_1}{A^2} = 8\,\mu^2\,\epsilon_1, \tag{70}$$

showing that $\tilde{f}_0$ is negative and $\tilde{f}_1$ is positive. This shows that no nonpositive w exists so that $\tilde{f}(w)$ vanishes. This shows that in this case no solution exists.

To summarize, the threshold occurs at $u_3 = u_2$, and no reaction is possible if

$$\mu \geq \frac{\sqrt{27}}{4}\,\epsilon_0^2, \tag{71}$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{4}{\ell} \leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{27}}\,\frac{m^3}{E_0^2}. \tag{72}$$

By inserting the available values for E_0 and m we see that for $\ell \sim 10^{-11}$ TeV^{-1} or higher, the reaction would be forbidden. The value corresponds to highest energy up to 4×10^{11} TeV, which in principle can reach and be detected safely.

4 Concluding remarks

It was seen that introducing SU(2)-fuzziness in the space coordinates shifts the energy threshold for the pair-production reaction, in which an energetic photon reacts with a photon of the cosmic microwave background. Besides, if the energy corresponding to the fuzziness length is smaller than a certain value, this reaction would be forbidden. This is essentially due to the fact that introducing a Lie-group fuzziness in the space coordinates, makes the momenta space compact iff the group is compact, hence introducing a cutoff for the momenta (and energy). It would be useful to compare the situation here with the case of fuzziness of κ-Poincaré type [13,14]. As discussed in [14] based on the key result

Eq. (15), the threshold value is not changed in κ-Poincaré case, at least up to the leading order corrections introduced by κ (see item (ii) after Eq. (15)). Instead, their result shows that for pair production above threshold the process is possible only by an energy value higher than the value corresponding to the classical limit, $\kappa \to \infty$ [14]. In this case the momentum space is not compact but reduced relative to the classical case. It has been there argued that an explanation for the exotic behavior of TeV-photons might be possible [14]. A notable difference between that work and the present work is that here the momentum space is compact, and this could even make the pair-production reaction impossible.

Acknowledgement: This work was partially supported by the research council of the Alzahra University.

References

[1] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, & J. E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. **172** (1995) 187;
Phys. Lett. B **331** (1994) 39.

[2] J. Lukierski, H. Ruegg, & W. J. Zakrzewski, Annals Phys. **243** (1995) 90;
J. Lukierski & H. Ruegg, Phys. Lett. B **329** (1994) 189.

[3] J. Madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp, & J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. C **16** (2000) 161.

[4] M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, & P. Presnajder, Nucl. Phys. B **567** (2000) 360.

[5] N. Seiberg & E. Witten, JHEP **9909** (1999) 032;
A. Connes, M. R. Douglas, & A. Schwarz, JHEP **9802** (1998) 003;
M. R. Douglas & C. Hull, JHEP **9802** (1998) 008;
H. Arfaei & M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Nucl. Phys. B **526** (1998) 278.

[6] M. R. Douglas & N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 977;
R. J. Szabo, Phys. Rept. **378** (2003) 207.

[7] A. Anisimov, T. Banks, M. Dine, & M. Graesser, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 085032;
C. D. Carone, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **37** (2006) 96;
I. Hinchliffe, N. Kersting , & Y. L. Ma, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **19** (2004) 179;
G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Doplicher, S.-k. Nam, & Y.-S. Seo, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 085008;
S. Godfrey & M. A. Doncheski, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 015005;
J. L. Hewett, F. J. Petriello, & T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 075012.

[8] A. H. Fatollahi & M. Khorrami, Europhys. Lett. **80** (2007) 20003.

[9] M. Punch, *et al.*, Nature **358** (1992) 477;
F. A. Aharonian, *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **349** (1999) 11A;
F. A. Aharonian, *et al.* (H.E.S.S. coll.), Astron. Astrophys. **425** (2004) L13;
K. Kosack, *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **608** (2004) L97;
K. Tsuchiya, *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **606** (2004) L115;
J. Albert, *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **638** (2006) L101.

[10] R. Aloisio, P. Blasi, P. L. Ghia, & A. F. Grillo, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 053010;
F. W. Stecker & S. L. Glashow, Astropart. Phys. **16** (2001) 97;
U. Jacob & T. Piran, Nature Phys. **3** (2007) 87.

[11] J. Albert, *et al.*, 0708.2889 [astro-ph];
T. Piran, astro-ph/0407462;
G. Amelino-Camelia, gr-qc/0412136.

[12] F. W. Stecker, New Astron. Rev. **48** (2004) 437.

[13] G. Amelino-Camelia, & T. Piran, Phys. Lett. B **497** (2001) 265;
Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 036005;
G. Amelino-Camelia, M. Arzano, & L. Doplicher, hep-th/0205047.

[14] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Lukierski, & A. Nowicki, Czech. J. Phys. **51** (2001) 1247.